REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Official Action mailed September 19, 2006. Reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Status:

By the forgoing amendment, various claims have been amended to clarify the claim language. These amendments are not intended to narrow or change the scope of the claims. No claims are added or cancelled. Thus, claims 1-49 are currently pending for further action.

Prior Art:

Claims 1-3, 10, 12, 14, 24, 25, 39 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable in view of the combined teachings of a document entitled "Flash MX Tutorials" ("Flash") and U.S. Patent No. 6,483,609 to Ueno et al. ("Ueno"). For at least the following reasons, this rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 recites:

> A method of transitioning between two high resolution images in a slideshow, said method comprising:
> displaying a first image as part of said slideshow;
> replacing said display of said first image with a display of a lower resolution copy of said first image; and
> continuing said slideshow by fading out said display of said lower resolution copy of said first image to reveal a display of a second image.

Applicant initially notes that the claimed method occurs "in a slideshow," i.e., as images are being displayed sequentially. (*See* Applicant's specification, paragraph 0017). Consequently, claim 1 recites a method in which a first image being displayed is replaced by a lower

resolution copy of the same image. While this lower resolution copy is being displayed, it is faded out from the display to "reveal" a second image that is then visible.

In contrast, the Flash and Ueno references do not teach or suggested the claimed method of transitioning between images in a slideshow. Flash and Ueno, whether taken together or singly, do not teach or suggest replacing a first image being displayed as part of a slideshow with a lower resolution copy of that same image and then fading out the lower resolution copy of the first image to reveal a second image.

The Flash reference is a tutorial for Macromedia Flash MX, an application for presenting video over the Web. As cited by the Office Action, Flash teaches that "[w]hen you import an image, you can check and modify settings that compress the image. While compressing images reduces the file size of your movie, compression can affect image quality; the goal is to strike a balance between compression settings and image quality." (Flash, p. 30). Applicant acknowledges that it is known to compress the data representing an image or movie to conserve memory. However, this does not teach or suggest, *in a slideshow*, replacing a displayed first image with a lower resolution copy *of the same image* and then fading out the lower resolution copy to reveal a second image.

The Flash reference does teach using the Flash MX program to fade between different images. A specific example is given in which the program fades between images of three different cars. (Flash, pp. 32-36). According to Flash, "you specify settings for beginning and ending keyframes, then specify tweening for those frames and the frames in between. Flash creates the transitional animation from the first keyframe in the animation to the last." (Flash, p. 32). However, this is merely a transition between three ***different*** images or views. Flash never teaches or suggests replacing a high-res image with a low-res copy of ***the same image*** as claimed.

In fact, Flash does not teach or suggest any of the claimed subject matter. Flash does not teach or suggest replacing a first image with a lower resolution copy of that same image during a slideshow and then fading out the lower resolution copy of the first image to reveal a second image.

Ueno is even less relevant to the claimed subject matter than Flash. Ueno teaches a system in which an image is scanned by a scanner and then divided into different "layers," which are then compressed. According to Ueno, "input image information is converted into the multilayer data format consisting of a first piece of image data, a second piece of image data, and selection data ... For example, a picture part such as a photo in the input image information can be made the first piece of image data, color information in a text or line drawing part can be made the second piece of image data, and form information in the text or line drawing part can be made the selection data." (Ueno, col. 2, lines 32-45). "The first piece of image plane after undergoing the resolution conversion is input to the first compression section 15, the second image plane after undergoing the resolution conversion is input to the second compression section 16, and the selection image plane after undergoing the resolution conversion is input to the third compression section 17. Predetermined compression processing is performed for the planes separately at steps S107, S108, and S109." (Ueno, col. 6, lines 17-25).

Thus, Ueno teaches compressing different "layers" or components of a single image that has been scanned. Ueno does not teach or suggest anything about a slideshow. Ueno does not teach or suggest replacing a first image with a lower resolution copy of that same image during a slideshow and then fading out the lower resolution copy of the first image to reveal a second image.

Neither of the two references currently applied teach or suggest any of the subject matter of claim 1. Specifically, Flash and Ueno, taken together or singly, fail to teach or suggest replacing a first image with a lower resolution copy of that same image during a slideshow and then fading out the lower resolution copy of the first image to reveal a second image. "To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Accord. M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). For at least these reasons, the rejection based on Flash and Ueno of claim 1 and its dependent claims should be immediately reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 24 recites:

> A media viewer application stored on a medium for storing processor-readable instructions, said application comprising a slideshow function, wherein said slideshow function, when invoked, automatically displays a sequence of images stored on a selected storage medium to produce a slideshow;
>
> wherein said slideshow function is configured to display a first image as part of said slideshow, replace display of said first image with a display of a lower resolution copy of said first image and then fade out said lower resolution copy of said first image to reveal a display of a second image.

Claim 24 is a software claim in the style approved by the Federal Circuit in the case *In re Beauregard*. Claim 24, similar to claim 1, recites software or "a media viewer application" stored on a medium for storing processor-readable instructions. The claimed application produces a slideshow in which the slideshow function "is configured display a first image as part of said slideshow, replace display of said first image with a display of a lower resolution copy of said first image and then fade out said lower resolution copy of said first image to reveal a display of a second image."

As demonstrated above, the combination of Flash and Ueno utterly fails to teach or suggest this subject matter in any form. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 24 and its dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 4-9, 11, 13, 15-23, 26-28, 30 and 32-49 were rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combined teachings of Flash, Ueno and U.S. Patent No. 6,738,075 to Torres et al. ("Torres"). This rejection is traversed for at least the same reasons given above regarding the inapplicability of Flash and Ueno and for at least the following additional reasons.

Independent claim 33 recites:

> A system for displaying images stored on a storage medium, said system comprising:
> a video monitor;
> a device for reading a data storage medium and outputting a signal to said video monitor; and
> a media viewer application operational with said device for reading said data storage medium, wherein said media viewer application further comprises a slideshow function that, when invoked, automatically displays images stored on said data storage medium to produce a slideshow;
> wherein said slideshow function is configured to display a first image as part of a slideshow, replace display of said first image with a display of a lower resolution copy of said first image and then fade out said display of said lower resolution copy of said first image to reveal display of a second image.

As demonstrated above, the combination of Flash and Ueno utterly fails to teach or suggest the claimed slideshow function in which "said slideshow function is configured to display a first image as part of a slideshow, replace display of said first image with a display of a lower resolution copy of said first image and then fade out said display of said lower resolution copy of said first image to reveal display of a second image."

Torres also does not teach or suggest this subject matter, nor does the Office Action allege that Torres teaches such subject matter. Rather, Torres is cited merely as teaching a

video monitor and a device for reading a data storage medium. (Action of 9/19/06, pp. 15-16).

Thus, the cited combination of prior art still fails to teach or suggest the claimed "slideshow function [that] is configured to display a first image as part of a slideshow, replace display of said first image with a display of a lower resolution copy of said first image and then fade out said display of said lower resolution copy of said first image to reveal display of a second image." For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 33 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claim 44 recites:

> A system for displaying images stored on a storage medium, said system comprising:
> means for reading a data storage medium and outputting a signal to a means for displaying images; and
> means for displaying a first image, replacing display of said first image with a display of a lower resolution copy of said first image and then fading out said display of said lower resolution copy of said first image to reveal a display of a second image.

As demonstrated above, the combination of Flash and Ueno utterly fails to teach or suggest the claimed "means for displaying a first image, replacing display of said first image with a display of a lower resolution copy of said first image and then fading out said display of said lower resolution copy of said first image to reveal a display of a second image." Torres does not teach or suggest this subject matter, nor does the Office Action allege that Torres teaches such subject matter. Rather, Torres is cited merely as teaching a video monitor and a device for reading a data storage medium. (Action of 9/19/06, pp. 15-16).

Thus, the cited combination of prior art still fails to teach or suggest the claimed "means for replacing a first image with a lower resolution copy of said first image and then

fading out said lower resolution copy of said first image to reveal a second image." For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 44 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 15 recites:

> A system for transitioning between two high resolution images in a slideshow, said system comprising a video chip comprising:
> a display device;
> a first video buffer for containing a first image;
> a second video buffer for containing a second image; and
> a graphic buffer for containing a lower resolution copy of said first image;
> wherein said chip is configured to display said first image from said first video buffer on said display device, replace the display of said first image with a display of said lower resolution copy of said first image and fade out said display of said lower resolution copy of said first image to reveal a display of said second image on said display device.

As demonstrated above, the combination of Flash, Ueno and Torres fails to teach or suggest a system in which a "chip is configured to display said first image from said first video buffer on said display device, replace the display of said first image with a display of said lower resolution copy of said first image and fade out said display of said lower resolution copy of said first image to reveal a display of said second image on said display device." For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 15 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Additionally, the various dependent claims in the application recite further subject matter that is clearly patentable over the prior art cited. Specific, non-exclusive examples follow.

Claim 2 recites "disabling a graphic overlay and displaying said first image prior to replacing said first image." The Office Action concedes that Flash and Ueno do not "expressly teach" this subject matter, but then argues that "it is well known in the art, to select

all unwanted objects (including graphic overlays) and delete (clear) them as desired." (Action of 9/19/06, p/ 4). This argument, however, has nothing to do with what is actually claimed. Applicant does not recite a graphic overlay being cleared or deleted. Applicant recites that the graphic overlay is "disabled." This subject matter is not taught or suggested by the cited prior art, and the Office Action fails to even allege that such subject matter is taught. Moreover, the Office Action fails to indicate how or where the prior art teaches the claimed subject matter. For these several reasons, no *prima facie* case of unpatentability has been made with respect to claim 2.

Claim 3 recites "pointing a video overlay at said first image to display said first image prior to said replacing of said first image." In this regard, the Office Action alleges that Flash teaches this subject matter, citing pages 30 and 31 of Flash. (Action of 9/19/06, p. 5). However, this portion of Flash does not teach, suggest or even mention a video overlay that is pointed at a particular image to display that image. A video overlay is not simply a means for selecting an image to be displayed, as stated in the Office Action, but provides the additional capacity to overlay or fade in or out that image. (*Id.*). For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 3 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion:

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is thought to be clearly in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the application in light of these remarks is courteously solicited. If any fees are owed in connection with this paper that have not been elsewhere authorized, authorization is hereby given to charge those fees to Deposit Account 18-0013 in the name of Rader, Fishman & Grauer PLLC. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: December 19, 2006

Steven L. Nichols
Registration No. 40,326

Steven L. Nichols, Esq.
Managing Partner, Utah Office
Rader Fishman & Grauer PLLC
River Park Corporate Center One
10653 S. River Front Parkway, Suite 150
South Jordan, Utah 84095

(801) 572-8066
(801) 572-7666 (fax)

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on December 19, 2006. Number of Pages: 23

Rebecca R. Schow